



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,781	11/18/2003	Zyad Ahmad Dwekat	024777.0126PTUS	4548
7590		04/03/2008	EXAMINER	
IP Department Patton Boggs, LLP Suite 3000 2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, TX 75201			AL AUBAIDI, RASHA S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/03/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/715,781	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DWEKAT ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> RASHA S. AL AUBAIDI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/18/2003.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/06/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

##### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-34 are ejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (US PAT # 6,285,748).

Regarding claim 1, Lewis teaches a method for managing telecommunication trunk groups (reads on the network traffic controller system, see abstract), the method comprising: receiving information regarding the configuration of telephony circuits

comprising each trunk group to be managed (see col. 1, lines 35-38); receiving traffic information regarding the historical volume of traffic (see col. 1, lines 39-52) using the hardware associated with trunk groups (see col. 3, lines 11-18).

Lewis teaches the terminals 102, 104 and 106, have a display unit as shown in Figs. 1 and 2.

However, Lewis does not specifically teach "displaying information regarding at least one trunk group...etc" as recited in claim 1.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have these kind of information presented on display in order to make these information visible and easy to track. The use of display is old and well known in the art.

Claims 7, 13, 19, 29 and 34 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. The claimed feature of "determining the percentage utilization of each trunk group...etc" as recited in claims 13 and 29 may read on table 1 (see col. 4).

Claims 2-4, 14-15 20-23 and 30-31 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 13, 19 and 29. Lewis teaches that the

monitoring and controlling the traffic is done automatically. Lewis does not teach that a user may select and control the displayed trunk group as recited in claims 12, 14, 20 and 30. However, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to controlling trunk group either manually or automatically. The feature of automatic verses manual is obvious and well known in the art and it does not raise to the level of patentability. *In re Venner*, 262 F. 2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); the court held that broadly providing an automatic or mechanical means to replace a manual activity which accomplished the same result is not sufficient over prior art.

The limitations of claims 5-6, 16-18 and 32-33 of "removal" and "addition" of trunk are obvious and well known in the art because obviously an ordinary skill in the art may select and choose to add more trunks or remove trunks based on the need and desire.

Regarding claims 8-10 and 24-26, see col. 3, lines 56-67 and col. 4, lines 1-43.

Regarding claims 11 and 27 limitations, see col. 1, lines 8-22, col. 2, lines 1-14 and col. 4, lines 53-67.

For claims 12 and 28, see Fig. 3.

***Conclusion***

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rasha S. AL-Aubaidi whose telephone number is (571)

272-7481. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (571) 272-7488.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Rasha S AL-Aubaidi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614